

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

WILSON AEROSPACE LLC,

**Plaintiff,**

V.

# THE BOEING COMPANY INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-00847-JHC

**ORDER RE: MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION**

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration. Dkt. #

145. “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.”

LCR 7(h)(1).

Plaintiff does not make this showing. To the contrary, the Third Amended Complaint says, “Wilson’s trademark rights are valid and subsisting and each of the ‘FFTD’ and ‘Fluid Fitting Torque Device’ trademarks are distinctive and *have secondary meaning* in association with Wilson’s goods as evidenced by the registrations of both trademarks by the U.S. Trademark Office.” Dkt. # 140 at 72 (emphasis added). But Plaintiff now equates secondary meaning with

1 acquired distinctiveness, while it argues “neither one of Wilson’s registrations at issue relied  
2 upon acquired distinctiveness to obtain a registration.” Dkt. # 145 at 2-3; *see id.* (“secondary  
3 meaning (‘acquired distinctiveness’)”). As a result, these new arguments appear to contradict the  
4 Third Amended Complaint.

5 For these reasons, the Court DENIES the motion.

6 Dated this 28th day of March, 2025.

7  
8 

9 John H. Chun  
United States District Judge